

Transportation

State Highway Program

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 593)

LFB Summary Items for Which Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
3	Major Highway Development -- Project Enumeration (Paper #845)
--	Major Highway Project Selection Process (Paper #846)
6(part)	State Highway Maps (Paper #847)
--	Reduce Capacity to Design Future Projects (Paper #848)
--	Savings from Instituting Changes in Contaminated Site Remediation (Paper #849)
--	Streamline Materials Acceptance Process (Paper #850)
--	Eliminate Production of Certain Highway Signs (Paper #851)
--	Discontinue Mailing Letting Reports (Paper #852)
7	Highway Landscaping by DOC and WCC Work Crews (see Paper #583)

Budget Memo

Agency: WisDOT - State Highway Program

Staff Recommendations:

((WisDOT is a "base" agency,
so no action is needed on "take no action" or "maintain current law"
alternatives))

Paper No. 845: Burke Motion (Six Recommended Projects) (part A)
Burke Motion (Future Major Project) (part B)
(ask permission to do your motion first)

Comments: **Burke Motion #1** - a) enumerate the six projects (i.e. alt A(1); b) prohibit TPC from recommending any new projects until 2002, and delete some SEG \$ (i.e. alt B(2)); c) specify that projects cannot be recommended for enumeration unless all projects can be started in six years or less (i.e. alt B(2) in FB Paper #846); d) require TPC to reprioritize all currently enumerated projects, which haven't yet been moved into the construction phase (or won't be constructed within the next year), to determine which ones can be started in the next six years based on available & projected funding. The TPC would then make recommendations to the legislature to re-enumerate highway projects that can be completed in the next six years, and recommend projects to be de-listed for the time being. Every 2 years the TPC would meet again, and project projects out for the next six years.

Part "d" of your motion is obviously the key point. We don't have enough \$ to fund all the enumerated projects in a timely manner, and it's unfair and dishonest to be promising highway projects 10 to 15 years down the line. Let's throw all the enumerated projects into a hopper, take another look at them, and decide which are the most important and should be started in the next 6 years. Also, let's require the TPC make some choices and help the legislature out. Currently, they just say yes to everything and don't worry about funding - that's wrong and not helpful.

If your motion doesn't pass, or Jensen won't let you take it up first, you should vote against enumerating the six newly proposed highway projects (i.e. alt 2 under part A of this paper). It's just bad budgeting to promise expensive road projects 10 to 15 years in the future.

Also, you should vote for alt 2 under Part B of this paper if your motion doesn't pass. (see paragraphs 3, 4, 5 & 6 on this issue)

Burke Motion #2: Require WisDOT to include a discussion about secondary land use impacts in Door County in its EIS on the STH 57 program being enumerated here - for the stretch of road north of Sturgeon Bay.

There's some confusion as to whether WisDOT is considering this issue in it's EIS for the project, but this just makes it very clear (in non statutory language) that they must consider it. It's my understanding that WisDOT thinks there are "no" land use impacts associated with this project.

Cowles may want to comment on this, since he spends a lot of his time trying to save Door County from excessive development.

Director motion: www.fairandhonest.org for TPC

Jensen 3

Paper No. 846: Part A -- Alternative 1 (with motion, see below)

Comments: The TPC really does need to be reconstituted, and alt 1 is a good attempt to make some needed changes and increase accountability. However, you have two motions that will make alt 1 even better.

Also, Rep. Jensen apparently wants to eliminate the TPC altogether. But, as long as we beef up the TPC's duties a little bit, they could provide a public forum for discussing these projects and provide a check on WisDOT (and the gov). So, if we make these changes, it's much better to retain the TPC.

Burke Motion: Add the chairs of the Senate and Assembly Environmental Committees to the reconstituted TPC.

Highways have major environmental impacts, and these folks should be included. That's all there is to it.

Decker motion

Part B - Alternative 1

Comments: If your motion passed in the previous paper (#845), then there is no need to do anything here because alt 1 will have already been adopted. But, if your motion failed, then alt 1 is appropriate here. Let's make the TPC at least moderately useful.

Paper No. 847: Alternative 2

Comments: This seems to be a reasonable middle ground on the highway maps issue, plus it saves some money compared to the gov's proposal (see paragraph 9).

Amendments

Paper No. 848: Alternative 3 (no action needed)

Comments: No action needed to maintain current law (and therefore the gov's recommendation). This is a bone for the roadbuilders, plus it seems to make sense to keep a large pool of engineered projects ready. (see paragraph 4)

Paper No. 849: Alternative 1

Comments: May as well let WisDOT take advantage of these new, more cost-effective DNR rules regarding environmental cleanups and save some money (see paragraphs 1 & 2). Enviro don't really like the landspreading rule, but paragraph 4 indicates that WisDOT can do it, so we might as well budget the cost savings.

Paper No. 850: Alternative 1

Comments: WisDOT is a money-saving machine (see paragraphs 1 & 2).

Paper No. 851: Alternative 6 (no action needed)

Comments: No action needed to maintain current law. I think it's best to continue replacing all these signs. The minimal cost savings possible are not worth the potential hassles and confusion to motorists. Plus, I like to know what river I'm driving over. (see paragraphs 3, 4 & 5)

Alt 4 would probably be ok if someone really wants to delete some funding here.

Paper No. 852: Alternative 2

Comments: I think it's a good idea to continue providing these letting reports to the public, but charging a modest fee to cover costs sounds like a good idea (hence alt 2) (see paragraph 6). But, alt 3 (take no action would also be ok). No need to irritate the roadbuilders over such a little amount of cost savings.

*For the item that FB didn't prepare papers on, **action is needed**, to get it included in the bill.*

(NOTE: Just FYI - In case anyone asks, Item 5 here just replaces lost federal funds for the traffic operations center. The center operates the variable message signs and freeway ramp meters on the Milwaukee area freeway system, and serves as an emergency vehicle dispatcher in the event of an accident.)

Agency: DOT - State Highways

Staff Recommendations:

Paper No. 853: Alternative 4

Comments: Alt. 4 is in Burke Plan B and probably should be passed regardless. See paragraphs 9, 10, and 11.

DOT wants Alt. 1.

Paper No. 854: Alternative 1

Comments: If Burke Plan B didn't pass, then go with the gov on majors, i.e. Alt. 1. Also, FB makes a good case for Alt. 4 in paragraph 9.

DOT wants Alt. 1.

Paper No. 855: Alternative 3

Comments: This is what's in Burke Plan B and is probably a good idea whether or not your plan passed. (See paragraphs 4 and 5.)

Mke County supports Alt. 3. DOT wants Alt. 1.

Paper No. 856: Approve Modification to Base *See H*

Comments: Both Burke Plan B and Jensen Plan address need for I-94 PE money.

Agency: DOT - State Highways

Staff Recommendations:

Paper No. 853: Alternative 4

Comments: Alt. 4 is in Burke Plan B and probably should be passed regardless. See paragraphs 9, 10, and 11.

DOT wants Alt. 1.

Paper No. 854: Alternative 1

Comments: If Burke Plan B didn't pass, then go with the gov on majors, i.e. Alt. 1. Also, FB makes a good case for Alt. 4 in paragraph 9.

DOT wants Alt. 1.

Paper No. 855: Alternative 3

Comments: This is what's in Burke Plan B and is probably a good idea whether or not your plan passed. (See paragraphs 4 and 5.)

Mke County supports Alt. 3. DOT wants Alt. 1.

Paper No. 856: Approve Modification to Base

Comments: Both Burke Plan B and Jensen Plan address need for I-94 PE money. > Jett

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Major Highway Development -- Project Enumeration (DOT -- State Highway Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 595, #3]

CURRENT LAW

Major highway projects are defined as projects that have an estimated cost exceeding \$5,000,000 and consist of at least one of the following: (a) construction of a new highway of 2.5 miles or more in length; (b) relocation of 2.5 miles or more of existing roadway; (c) the addition of one or more lanes at least five miles in length; or (d) the improvement of 10 miles or more of an existing divided expressway to freeway standards.

Major highway projects must be enumerated in the statutes before the Department of Transportation can begin construction. There are currently over 30 highway segments that are enumerated, but that have not been completed. Over \$1 billion of construction costs remain before these projects can be completed. The projects have anticipated completion dates that range from this year to 2008, based on the funding level in the bill.

GOVERNOR

Enumerate the following six major highway projects (listed in order of highway number), as recommended by the Transportation Projects Commission (TPC).

<u>Highway</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Estimated Cost in 1996 Dollars (In Millions)*</u>
STH 11	Burlington Bypass	Walworth and Racine	\$66.0 to \$71.7**
USH 12	I-90/94 to Ski Hi Road	Sauk	50.0
USH 53	I-90 to USH 14/61	La Crosse	67.1
STH 57	CTH A to STH 42	Kewaunee and Door	42.9
USH 141	Lemere Road to 6th Road	Oconto and Marinette	40.3
USH 151	Dickeyville to Belmont	Grant and Lafayette	65.0
	TOTAL		\$331.3 to \$337.0

*Excludes design cost.

**Cost depends upon which route is chosen.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The total cost of the six projects, excluding design costs, is estimated between \$331.3 million and \$337.0 million in 1996 dollars.

2. The bill would provide \$162.0 million annually for the major highway development program. In order to compare the level of funding available under the bill with the cost of the proposed projects, it is necessary to convert the appropriated amounts into 1996 program dollars. Appropriations exceed the program budget because the appropriated amounts must also cover the cost of design and contract change orders. Therefore, while the bill would appropriate \$324 million over the biennium, this translates to only \$246.1 million in 1996 program dollars. Thus, if these projects are enumerated, and the funding for the major highway program stays as it is in the bill, the total cost of outstanding projects would be \$85 million greater at the end of the 1997-99 biennium.

3. Given the existing backlog of projects and the limited resources available, some have questioned whether these projects should be enumerated this biennium. When asked this question during his testimony before the Committee, the DOT Secretary responded that enumeration would bring the selection process to closure for projects that have been in the study mode for several years and that enumeration gives some answer to the communities that would be affected by the projects. In addition, businesses or residents near the highway routes want to know whether their land will be taken, and unless the projects are enumerated, DOT cannot proceed with the engineering needed to determine the precise route of the highway. The DOT Secretary also indicated, however, that he would support a moratorium on further enumerations.

4. A moratorium has also been suggested by several legislators and the Legislative Audit Bureau. In addition, the Transportation Finance Study Commission, which was established by the 1995 transportation budget, recommended that after the six projects in the bill are enumerated, a four-year moratorium should be placed on further enumerations. A

moratorium on future enumerations would gradually reduce the size of the major highway project backlog.

5. If the TPC were prevented from recommending projects to the Governor and Legislature until 2002 (a two-cycle moratorium), DOT's base budget (\$5,000,000) for performing the analysis customarily done before projects are brought to the TPC could be removed.

6. While the full \$5,000,000 could be removed each year, it may be appropriate to complete the work that is already in progress. DOT has already started an environmental impact statement for one potential project (USH 41 in Marinette and Oconto counties). Completing this work would require \$2,800,000 over the biennium. If funding is maintained to complete this work, \$2,200,000 could be removed in 1997-98 and \$5,000,000 could be removed in 1998-99.

7. These savings would not be permanent. DOT would need to begin work on draft environmental impact statements in the 1999-2001 biennium in preparation for the TPC process in 2002.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. Six Recommended Projects

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to enumerate the six projects.
2. Take no action.

B. Future Major Projects

1. Prohibit the Transportation Projects Commission from recommending any projects to the Governor and Legislature until 2002. Delete \$5,000,000 SEG annually to reflect savings from not doing environmental impact statements or other work customarily done to prepare projects for consideration by the TPC.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$10,000,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$10,000,000]

2. Prohibit the Transportation Projects Commission from recommending any projects to the Governor and Legislature until 2002. Delete \$2,200,000 SEG in 1997-98 and

\$5,000,000 SEG in 1998-99 to reflect savings from not doing environmental impact statements or other work customarily done to prepare projects for consideration by the TPC, except to complete environmental impact statements already in progress.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$7,200,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$7,200,000]

3. Take no action.

Prepared by: Jon Dyck

Six projects
Alt 1

MO#			
BURKE	Y	<u>N</u>	A
DECKER	Y	<u>N</u>	A
GEORGE	Y	<u>N</u>	A
JAUCH	Y	<u>N</u>	A
WINEKE	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
SHIBILSKI	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
COWLES	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
PANZER	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
JENSEN	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
OURADA	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
HARSDORF	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
ALBERS	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
GARD	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
KAUFERT	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
LINTON	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A
COGGS	<u>Y</u>	<u>N</u>	A

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS 0

Future major projects
B2

MO#			
BURKE	<u>Y</u>	N	A
DECKER	<u>Y</u>	N	A
GEORGE	<u>Y</u>	N	A
JAUCH	<u>Y</u>	N	A
WINEKE	<u>Y</u>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<u>Y</u>	N	A
COWLES	<u>Y</u>	N	A
PANZER	<u>Y</u>	N	A
JENSEN	<u>Y</u>	N	A
OURADA	<u>Y</u>	N	A
HARSDORF	<u>Y</u>	N	A
ALBERS	<u>Y</u>	N	A
GARD	<u>Y</u>	N	A
KAUFERT	<u>Y</u>	N	A
LINTON	<u>Y</u>	N	A
COGGS	<u>Y</u>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

TRANSPORTATION

Secondary Land-Use Impacts of STH 57 Improvement

Motion:

Move to require that DOT address the impacts of the proposed major highway project on STH 57 between CTH A in Kewaunee County and STH 42 in Door County on land-use patterns in the area of Door County north of Sturgeon Bay in preparing the final environmental impact statement for this project.

Note:

The bill would enumerate a major highway project on STH 57 in Kewaunee and Door Counties, roughly between Dykesville and Sturgeon Bay. This project would upgrade a two-lane highway to four lanes. The draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for this project has already been completed, and the Department is currently working on the final EIS.

The motion would require that DOT address the secondary land-use impacts of completing the project on the area of Door County north of Sturgeon Bay. DOT indicates that the draft EIS contains a section addressing secondary land-use impacts within the highway corridor. The report finds that residential and commercial development is currently occurring, and would not be impacted significantly by the completion of the highway project.

[illegible]

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Major Highway Project Selection Process (DOT -- State Highway Program)

CURRENT LAW

Major highway projects are defined as projects that have an estimated cost exceeding \$5,000,000 and consist of at least one of the following: (a) construction of a new highway of 2.5 miles or more in length; (b) relocation of 2.5 miles or more of existing roadway; (c) the addition of one or more lanes at least five miles in length; or (d) the improvement of 10 miles or more of an existing divided highway to freeway standards.

Major highway projects must be enumerated in the statutes before the Department of Transportation can begin construction. The Transportation Projects Commission (TPC) biennially reviews a list of projects recommended by DOT and then recommends a list of projects to the Governor and Legislature. The Governor, then, may or may not include that list in the executive budget bill. The TPC is composed of the Governor, three public members appointed by the Governor, three members from the majority party in each house, two members from the minority party in each house and the Secretary of Transportation (who is a nonvoting member). The legislative members are appointed in the same manner as committee appointments are made in their respective houses.

GOVERNOR

No provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In recent months, several legislators and the Legislative Audit Bureau have questioned whether the process for selecting major highway projects is adequate.

2. The following concerns with the process have been identified by various parties:

a. The TPC has never failed to recommend for enumeration one of the DOT-recommended projects.

b. The TPC is not required to consider funding availability and thus can approve more projects than is prudent given the budget for major improvements. Although the Governor and Legislature could scale back the TPC's recommendations, this has not happened. (In some years, additional projects have been added.) Consequently, the time between when a project is enumerated and when it can be started has increased to over ten years.

c. Once it has recommended a project for enumeration, the TPC plays no ongoing role in reexamining its value or priority, despite the fact that it may not be built for many years.

d. The long time between enumeration and construction is frustrating to the people who would be affected by the project.

e. Legislators who seek appointment to the TPC may do so because the projects under consideration affect their districts. The membership, therefore, may have a strong interest in voting to recommend the projects.

3. Since the TPC has not rejected any projects recommended by DOT, one alternative to simplify the process would be to include proposed projects as part of the Department's budget request. The Governor and Legislature could then make the decision whether to enumerate them or not.

4. During the most recent TPC cycle, DOT estimates that the Department incurred costs of \$45,200 to staff the project selection process. This included \$42,000 for DOT staff (an estimated 10.8 months of work spread over five employees) plus an additional \$3,200 for costs related to TPC meetings. It is possible that some, or perhaps all, of these costs would be borne under an alternative project selection process.

5. Even if the TPC has not rejected any of DOT's recommended projects, it may serve a useful purpose. Having the Department's recommendations formally reviewed, including the holding of public hearings, may have a positive impact on the process DOT uses to decide which projects to advance to the TPC. In addition, having minority party representation on the TPC may help to ensure that project selection is being done on a bipartisan basis.

6. If DOT recommended projects as part of its budget request, this would eliminate one stage in the process, but it may not prevent expensive additions to the list at later stages. In 1989, projects costing over \$500 million (in 1989 dollars) were added to the list of \$280 million worth of projects recommended by the TPC. These added projects account for much of the current delay between enumeration and construction.

7. Even after the extensive list that was enumerated in 1989, the TPC recommended an additional \$295.8 million in projects in 1991 (more than it had recommended in 1989), including a \$17.5 million project that was not included on DOT's list of recommendations.

7. To increase the consideration of the fiscal impact of adding projects and to weigh additions to the major highway program against other transportation priorities, it may help to reconstitute the membership of the TPC. One alternative would be to have the Commission be composed of the Co-Chairs of the Joint Finance Committee, as well as the chairs and ranking minority members of the highway standing committees in each house.

9. An additional step to increase the consideration of available funding would be to require the TPC (or DOT, if the TPC is eliminated), to only recommend projects that can be started in a reasonable amount of time. Typically, it takes six years to complete the final design, purchase real estate, arrange for the movement of utility facilities and prepare for the bidding of the project. Therefore, one alternative would be to specify that it must be possible to start all recommended projects within six years after they are enumerated, assuming that the program is maintained at a constant real-dollar level.

10. In order to allow for program expansion, it could also be specified that the TPC (or DOT) could make a separate recommendation for the enumeration of additional projects, on the condition that the additional projects be accompanied by a specific recommendation for the additional funding increases (above inflation) needed to ensure that these also could be started in six years.

11. Although these recommendations would not be binding on the Legislature or Governor, they would at least give members a better idea of the which projects could be done within available funding and how much additional funding would be needed to do more projects.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. Transportation Projects Commission

1. Reconstitute the membership of the TPC as follows: (a) the Governor; (b) two public members appointed by the Governor; (c) the two Co-Chairs of the Joint Finance Committee; (d) the chair and ranking minority member of the Assembly Highways and Transportation Committee or its successor; (e) the chair and ranking minority member of the

Senate Labor, Transportation and Financial Institutions Committee or its successor; and (f) the Secretary of Transportation, as a nonvoting member.

2. Eliminate the Transportation Projects Commission and specify that DOT recommend projects for enumeration to the Governor and Legislature as part of its biennial budget request.

3. Eliminate the Transportation Projects Commission and specify that DOT recommend projects for enumeration to the Governor and Legislature as part of its biennial budget request. Delete \$22,600 SEG annually to remove funding for staffing the project selection process.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$45,200
[Change to Bill]	- \$45,200]

4. Take no action.

B. Enumeration of Projects

1. Specify that projects cannot be recommended for enumeration unless all projects can be started in six years or less after being enumerated, assuming a constant, real-dollar program size. Establish an exception to this requirement if any additional project recommendations are accompanied by a specific recommended funding increase that would allow them to be started in six years or less.

2. Take no action.

Prepared by:

MO#	B1			
BURKE	Y	N	A	
DECKER	Y	N	A	
GEORGE	Y	N	A	
JAUCH	Y	N	A	
WINEKE	Y	N	A	
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A	
COWLES	Y	N	A	
PANZER	Y	N	A	
JENSEN	Y	N	A	
OURADA	Y	N	A	
HARSDORF	Y	N	A	
ALBERS	Y	N	A	
GARD	Y	N	A	
KAUFERT	Y	N	A	
LINTON	Y	N	A	
COGGS	Y	N	A	

MO#	Alt	A3		
BURKE	Y	N	A	
DECKER	Y	N	A	
GEORGE	Y	N	A	
JAUCH	Y	N	A	
WINEKE	Y	N	A	
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A	
COWLES	Y	N	A	
PANZER	Y	N	A	
JENSEN	Y	N	A	
OURADA	Y	N	A	
HARSDORF	Y	N	A	
ALBERS	Y	N	A	
GARD	Y	N	A	
KAUFERT	Y	N	A	
LINTON	Y	N	A	
COGGS	Y	N	A	

AYE 6 NO 10 ABS 0

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

TRANSPORTATION

Composition of the Transportation Projects Commission

Motion:

Move to modify Alternative A1 of LFB Paper #846 to include the chair of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Environmental Resources and the chair of the Assembly Committee on Environment, or their successor committees dealing with the environment.

MO#

1596

1 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
2 WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS 0

TRANSPORTATION

Membership of Transportation Projects Commission

Motion:

Move to reconstitute the membership of the Transportation Projects Commission to remove two of the three public members appointed by the Governor and add two county highway commissioners, one appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly and one appointed by the majority leader of the Senate.

Note:

The Transportation Projects Commission (TPC) biennially reviews a list of major highway projects recommended for enumeration by DOT and then recommends a list of projects to the Governor and Legislature. The Governor, then, may or may not include that list in the executive budget bill. Currently, the TPC is composed of the Governor, three public members appointed by the Governor, three members from the majority party in each house, two members from the minority party in each house and the Secretary of Transportation (who is a nonvoting member). The legislative members are appointed in the same manner as committee appointments are made in their respective houses.

This motion would replace two of the public members appointed by the Governor with two county highway commissioners, one appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly and one by the majority leader in the Senate.

MO# 2002

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

TRANSPORTATION

Enumeration of Major Highway Projects and the Transportation Projects Commission

Motion:

Move to require the Transportation Projects Commission (TPC) to meet in 1998 to consider an order of priority for currently enumerated projects that are not under construction in 1998 or within one year of construction in 1998. Specify that the TPC must make a recommendation to the Governor and Legislature by December 15, 1998, on the priority to be given these projects and a mechanism to implement this order of priority.

Note:

The TPC recommends potential major highway projects to the Legislature and Governor for enumeration. Major highway projects are required to be enumerated in the statutes before DOT can begin construction. DOT is not required to construct any of the enumerated projects, nor is it required to follow any order of priority. Typically, however, the Department begins construction on projects in the same order as they were enumerated.

This motion would require the TPC to examine projects that are currently enumerated, but are not yet under construction or within one year of construction, to develop an order of priority. and to make a recommendation to the Governor and Legislature as to how to implement this order of priority.

MO# 2027

BURKE	Y	A
DECKER	Y	A
GEORGE	Y	A
JAUCH	Y	A
WINEKE	Y	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	A
COWLES	Y	A
PANZER	Y	A

JENSEN	Y	A
OURADA	Y	A
HARSDORF	Y	A
ALBERS	Y	A
GARD	Y	A
KAUFERT	Y	A
LINTON	Y	A
COGGS	Y	A

790 ABS
AYE NO

TRANSPORTATION

Major Highway Project Scoring

Motion:

Move to require DOT to promulgate rules establishing a scoring system to evaluate potential major highway projects. Provide that the rules must specify a minimum score that a project must have before DOT can recommend it for enumeration. Require the submission of the initial rules under this provision to the rules clearinghouse by January 1, 1998.

Note:

Currently, DOT uses a scoring system for major projects based on the following goals: (a) enhance Wisconsin's economy (40%); (b) improve highway service (20%); (c) improve highway safety (20%); (d) minimize undesirable impacts (10%); and (e) serve community objectives (10%). The goals and the relative weights given these goals are established by DOT policy, rather than by administrative rule.

This motion would require DOT to establish the scoring criteria by administrative rule. In addition, the motion would require that potential projects obtain a score above a minimum level before the Department can recommend them for enumeration.

MO# _____

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
JENSEN	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

Motion #2016

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS 0

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

State Highway Maps (DOT -- State Highway Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 596, #6(part)]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Transportation is required, by statute, to produce folded highway maps for free distribution to the public. In addition, DOT is required to distribute 500 maps to each officer and member of the Legislature and 300 to the Legislative Reference Bureau. Legislators may request additional maps at no charge.

Base funding for maps is \$60,000 annually.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$250,000 SEG annually to increase the number of folded highway maps produced by DOT to two million annually. Prior to the current biennium, DOT printed approximately two million maps per year, but will produce fewer than one million annually in 1996 and 1997.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Prior to the 1995-97 biennium, DOT printed about two million maps per year at an annual cost of about \$240,000, which was covered out of the budget of the Division of Business Management (DBM). In response to funding reductions in the 1995-97 biennium, DBM stopped funding the printing of maps and the funding was instead provided from other sources, including the state highway program and the Secretary's office. The bill would provide \$250,000

annually, which, when added to base funding of \$60,000, would be sufficient to again produce two million maps annually.

2. Of the four million 1993-94 edition maps printed over a two-year period, 582,000 were distributed to the Legislature, 1.5 million were distributed by the Division (now Department) of Tourism and 1.9 million were distributed by the Department of Transportation. In 1994-95, almost 2.5 million maps were printed, but only 760,000 were printed in 1995-96 and 920,000 were printed in 1996-97. Due to this reduction, Tourism was given fewer maps to distribute and DOT has limited distribution at rest areas.

3. If increasing the funding for maps by \$250,000 annually is considered to be too high, one alternative would be to produce just one million maps per year and limit distribution, which was DOT's suggestion in its budget request to DOA. In its budget request, DOT estimated that printing one million maps would require an increase of \$100,000 annually, but based on a reestimate of the printing cost per map, only \$95,000 annually would be required.

4. Printing one million maps each year would require that distribution again be limited. In its budget request, DOT proposed to eliminate distribution of maps to the Department of Tourism and free distribution at rest areas. This may be considered appropriate since the demand for the maps is determined in part by their availability. If maps are made available for free at rest areas, for instance, travelers tend to pick them up whether they need them or not.

5. In addition, some have raised the concern that one of the largest users of maps are for-profit businesses, who use them to attract customers. Car rental companies, automobile dealerships, gas stations and convenience stores are some of the largest users. Limiting the number of maps printed would likely require DOT to limit its distribution for bulk requests from these and other businesses.

6. If the number of maps printed is cut back, private companies that print and sell their own maps may pick up much of the demand. These companies argue that the state should stop printing so many maps because it hurts their business.

7. During the current biennium, in addition to limiting distribution to Tourism and at rest areas, DOT originally proposed limiting members of the Legislature to 1,000 maps each. Due to opposition, however, DOT abandoned this policy and reserved enough maps to meet expected demand. In its budget request, DOT also proposed limiting the number of maps for legislators at 1,000 each.

8. Since the Department of Tourism received fewer maps this year than it has received in the past, it has had to limit the number it distributes, particularly in the case of bulk requests from businesses. In addition, Tourism tried to make greater use of a less-detailed map that was printed on the back of a brochure donated to the Department by an association of tourism-related businesses. The Department indicates that the maps are one of the most-requested

items that it distributes to potential visitors, and therefore, that not having any maps would harm the tourism business.

9. Another alternative would be to provide funding sufficient to produce 1.5 million maps annually. At this level, distribution to Tourism and to the Legislature would not need to be so severely limited. An increase of \$172,500 annually would be required to produce this many maps.

10. DOT has explored the issue of advertising or selling the maps to recover some of the printing cost. A bill provision that was removed for consideration as separate legislation would establish a committee to study this issue further and make recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor by July 1, 1998.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Provide \$250,000 SEG annually for the production and printing of folded highway maps. This would be sufficient to print about two million maps annually.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$500,000
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

2. Provide \$172,500 SEG annually for the production and printing of folded highway maps. This would be sufficient to print about 1.5 million maps annually.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$345,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$155,000]

3. Provide \$95,000 SEG annually for the production and printing of folded highway maps. This would be sufficient to print about one million maps annually.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$190,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$310,000]

4. Take no action.

Alternative 4	SEG
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill	- \$500,000]

Prepared by: Jon Dyck

MO#

Alt 2

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
JENSEN	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A

AYE

13

NO

3

ABS

0

TRANSPORTATION

Eliminate Folded Highway Map Production

Motion:

Move to delete the requirement that DOT publish folded highway maps for free distribution to the public and delete requirements that DOT distribute maps to each officer and member of the Legislature and to the Legislative Reference Bureau. Delete \$60,000 SEG annually to reflect this change.

Note:

DOT is required to produce highway service maps and distribute 50 to each officer and member of the Legislature, and any additional service maps upon request for a fee not less than the cost. In addition, DOT is required to print folded highway maps and distribute them free to the public. DOT is required to distribute 500 folded highway maps to each officer and member of the Legislature and 300 to the Legislative Reference Bureau. Legislators may request additional maps at no charge.

This motion would eliminate the requirement that DOT produce the folded maps and the requirements that DOT distribute them free to the public and to the Legislature.

Base funding for maps is \$60,000 SEG annually. The bill would provide an additional \$250,000 SEG annually to increase the number of folded highway maps produced by DOT to two million annually. This motion would delete the base funding for maps and, if offered as an alternative to the increase in the bill, would reduce funding for maps by \$310,000 SEG annually compared to the bill.

[Change to Base: -\$120,000 SEG]

[Change to Bill: -\$620,000 SEG']

Motion #3011

MO#	NAME	Y	N	A
3011	BURKE	Y	N	A
	DECKER	Y	N	A
	GEORGE	Y	N	A
	JAUCH	Y	N	A
	WINEKE	Y	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
	COWLES	Y	N	A
	PANZER	Y	N	A
3010	JENSEN	Y	N	A
	OURADA	Y	N	A
	HARSDORF	Y	N	A
	ALBERS	Y	N	A
	GARD	Y	N	A
	KAUFERT	Y	N	A
	LINTON	Y	N	A
	COGGS	Y	N	A

TRANSPORTATION

State Highway Maps

Motion:

Move to limit the free distribution of folded state highway maps to 500 annually for each member of the Assembly and 1,500 annually for each member of the Senate. Require DOT to charge a fee based on its costs of production for additional maps.

Note:

This motion would limit the number of free maps provided to each member of the Assembly to 500 and to each member of the Senate to 1,500. Additional copies of the maps could be purchased by a legislator through his or her legislative office account.

MO# _____

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
JENSEN	Y	N	A
1 OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
2 ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 7 NO 9 ABS _____